| **Student Name:** Tiffany Chan |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would place a significant tax on companies which replace workers with A.I. |
| --- |

| Student spoke for the duration of the specified time frame. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student offered and/or accepted a point of information relevant to the topic. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student spoke in a stylistic and persuasive manner (e.g. volume, speed, tone, diction, and flow). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student’s argument is complete in that it has relevant Claims, supported by sufficient Evidence/Warrants, Impacts, and Synthesis. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student argument reflects application of theory taught during class time. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student’s rebuttal is effective, and directly responds to an opponent’s arguments. | **N/A** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Student ably supported teammate’s case and arguments. | **N/A** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Student applied feedback from previous debate(s). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Competition Score: | 70 | | | | | |
| Rubric  1 - Unobserved.  2 - Student attempt noted. Needs extended teacher support to properly execute skill.  3 - Student effort noted. Can execute skill with minimal teacher input and guidance.  4 - Student can execute skill with little to no prompting.  5 - Student can execute skill without prompting; exceeds expectations for child of that level. | | | | | | |
| Teacher comments:  Good opening setting up a growing trend of deployment and economic change; the speed should be emphasised in greater detail. We want to frame this as a temporary pause to get a handle on the rapid development, rather than something we will do infinitely.  Set-up   * We need to highlight why this is the (a) the best way and (b) the only way. We need to explain why we need to force companies to adjust in this way, whilst we figure out the best way to accommodate these workers. * On job loss - good work highlighting what kinds of jobs are being hurt. What is the implication of this? We want to explain how you support them/if the state has a special duty or moral obligation to them. * We want to pause automation - until when? We need to specify what the long-term strategy is. * We must support upskilling, and explain how it happens. Will we keep this going until those workers retire and then phase out these jobs/allow AI adoption? What does the timescale look like? Don’t commit this is going to occur indefinitely - there needs to be a reason to do this now!   Argument 1   * We need to analyse why companies would go full steam ahead in absence of this tax. We need to first establish profit as a key motivator, and then how their rationale is likely to change under your world. How does this force companies to keep employing people, while you work to upskill them so this doesn’t need to happen? What happens in Opp’s world when they have to go all guns blazing? * Explain WHY they are in the position to be taking such jobs in the first place? Why do they lack education, or these skills? Were they born poor? This matters because we can connect this to the failure of the state to provide them with the requisite support and uplift - hence necessitating intervention. * How would it make their lives really hard? We need to explain HOW these people will suffer, and that they have no further optionality.   Argument 2   * On companies - if it is true that the AI is of poor quality, why would they use it?   We must explain how the speed of development of AI is so fast, that we need to give people time to breathe, and governments to figure out a plan of action. This approach allows for the development of appropriate regulations and safeguards to ensure a more responsible and beneficial integration of AI into the workforce.  05:00  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |